

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
DONALD CANTLIN, JR.

DONALD CANTLIN, JR.,	)	No. C 08-00982-JCS
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JOINT MOTION AND STIPULATION TO
	)	STAY PROCEEDING OR, IN THE
vs.	)	ALTERNATIVE, TO CONTINUE CASE
	)	MANAGEMENT DEADLINE AND
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,	)	CONFERENCE, AND TO EXTEND TIME;
<i>et al.</i> ,	)	[PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY;
	)	[PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE] ORDER
Defendants.	)	TO CONTINUE
	)	

On March 17, 2008, Defendant GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY filed Document 6, a Notice to Tag Along Action regarding the pending Multidistrict Litigation (“MDL”) in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, seeking among other things, to move Jurisdiction of this matter to that District. (Defendant GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY has faxed counsel copy of a cover letter showing that this notice was mailed to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, said notice to the JPML from counsel being necessary to initiate the transfer process.)

1 On July 29, 1991, the JPML entered an order transferring all asbestos personal injury  
2 cases pending in the federal courts to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of  
3 Pennsylvania, for coordinated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. (*In re Asbestos*  
4 *Products Liability Litigation* (no. VI). MDL No. 875., 771 F.Supp. 415 (1991)). That order also  
5 applies to “tag-along actions,” or actions involving common questions of fact filed after January  
6 17, 1991. Such actions are to be transferred to the eastern District of Pennsylvania as part of  
7 MDL 875, for coordinated pretrial proceedings.

8 The JPML has held that a district court has the authority to stay pending a transfer order.  
9 *In re Asbestos Products Liability Litigation*, 170 F. Supp. 2d 1348, 1349 n.1 (J.P.M.L. 2001)  
10 (“[T]hose courts concluding that such issues should be addressed by the transferee judge need  
11 not rule on them, and the process of 1407 transfer in MDL-875 can continue without any  
12 unnecessary interruption or delay.”)

13 The parties agree that it is likely that the JPML will transfer this matter to the Eastern  
14 District of Pennsylvania. The Clerk of the JPML has not entered a *Conditional Transfer Order*  
15 pursuant to JPML Rule 12(a) or filed an order to show cause why the action should not be  
16 transferred, pursuant to JPML Rule 13(b). It is likely the dates set forth in the *Case Management*  
17 *Scheduling Order* including the deadlines imposed by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule  
18 26, will pass before the Clerk of the JPML acts.

19 In addition, Plaintiff is attempting to serve Defendant CRAMP SHIPBUILDING AND  
20 DRYDOCK COMPANY.

21 The parties make this Motion on the grounds that a stay of this action would (a) promote  
22 judicial efficiency, (b) allow consistency in pretrial rulings, and (c) be most convenient to the  
23 parties.

24 For the reasons above, the parties hereby STIPULATE to and respectfully request the  
25 Court VACATE its *Case Management Scheduling Order* and that the Court issue an Order  
26 STAYING this action pending the outcome of the MDL Panel’s decision on the merits of the  
27 transfer.

28 ////

1 In the alternative, the parties hereby STIPULATE to and respectfully request that this  
2 Court vacate and continue the dates set forth in the *Case Management Scheduling Order* pending  
3 the outcome of the JPML's decision on the merits of the transfer.

4 Dated: April 9, 2008

BRAYTON❖PURCELL LLP

/s/ David R. Donadio

6 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
7 David R. Donadio  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 Dated: April 9, 2008

SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN &  
ARNOLD, LLP

/s/ Derek S. Johnson

11 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Derek S. Johnson  
13 Attorneys for Defendant  
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

14 Dated: April 9, 2008

CARROLL, BURDICK & MCDONOUGH LLP

/s/ John G. Lee

16 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
17 John G. Lee  
18 Attorneys for Defendant  
19 WARREN PUMPS LLC  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 [PROPOSED] **ORDER TO STAY**

2 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing date and deadlines specified in the *Case*  
3 *Management Scheduling Order* filed February 15, 2008 are hereby VACATED and that this  
4 action is STAYED pending the outcome of the JPML's decision on the merits of the transfer.

5  
6 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

7  
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Joseph C. Spero  
United States Magistrate Judge

10 [PROPOSED *ALTERNATIVE*] **ORDER TO CONTINUE**

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing date and deadlines specified in the *Case*  
12 *Management Scheduling Order* filed February 15, 2008, are hereby VACATED.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following case management deadlines are  
14 continued as follows:

15 1. The Case Management Conference is set for [a date after September 1, 2008 to  
16 wit:] \_\_\_\_\_, 2008; at \_\_\_\_\_ .m., Courtroom \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_th Floor, 450  
17 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California.

18 2. Last day to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR  
19 process selection, and discovery plan is set for 21 days before the Case Management Conference  
20 as set forth in paragraph 1, above.

21 3. Last day to file Joint ADR Certification with Stipulation to ADR Process or  
22 Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference is set for 21 days before the Case Management  
23 Conference as set forth in paragraph 1, above.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1           4.       Last day to complete initial disclosures or state objection to Rule 26(f) Report,  
2 file/serve Case Management Statement and file/serve Rule 26(f) Report is set for five court days  
3 before the Case Management Conference as set forth in paragraph 1, above.

4 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

5  
6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 Joseph C. Spero  
8 United States Magistrate Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28